

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 923

IR 016 019

AUTHOR Kurk, Gayle  
TITLE The Impact of Technology on the High School Media Center Budget.  
PUB DATE 93  
NOTE 67p.; Requirement for a Degree of Specialist in Education, Georgia State University.  
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)  
  
EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.  
DESCRIPTORS Access to Information; \*Budgets; Educational Media; \*Educational Technology; Expenditures; High Schools; \*Information Technology; \*Learning Resources Centers; \*Library Material Selection; Library Surveys; Media Specialists; Nonprint Media; Questionnaires; Resource Allocation; \*School Libraries  
IDENTIFIERS \*Georgia (Atlanta Metropolitan Area)

## ABSTRACT

Annual high school media center expenditures in Georgia were analyzed to determine what portions of the budget were being spent on print, non-print, and technology resources by high school media specialists. A 5-part 13-item questionnaire was developed as a data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire was distributed to all high school media specialists in five counties near Atlanta (Georgia). Seventy-seven percent (i.e., 56) of the 72 surveys sent out were returned. The questionnaire covered annual budget, print, and non-print expenditures and the use of technology. The findings were analyzed using descriptive statistics at the Georgia State University Research Center. Atlanta area schools spent 30 to 40 percent of their budgets on book resources, 16 to 47 percent on non-print resources, and 15-30 percent on technology resources. The study also found that 80 percent of the schools surveyed were using technology to access information. Book and print expenditures command the greater portion of the annual budget, but technology access to information is being used by most schools surveyed in the Atlanta area. Thirteen tables present study findings. The appendixes contain the cover letters and the questionnaire. (Contains 29 references.) (SLD)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED355923

## THE IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY ON THE HIGH SCHOOL MEDIA CENTER BUDGET

By

GAYLE KURK

Presented in partial fulfillment of requirements for  
the Degree of Specialist in Education in the  
Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
in the College of Education  
Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia  
1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL  
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN  
GRANTED BY

Gayle Kurk

2  
**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

112016019

ABSTRACT

IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY ON THE  
HIGH SCHOOL MEDIA CENTER BUDGET

by

GAYLE KURK

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze annual media center expenditures to determine what portion of the budget was being spent on the print, non-print and technology resources by high school media specialists.

Methods and Procedures

A four part questionnaire was designed as a data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire was distributed to all high school media specialists in the five counties near Atlanta, Georgia. The questionnaire covered annual budget, print and non-print expenditures, and use of technology. The findings were analyzed using descriptive statistics at the Georgia State University Research Center.

Results

Atlanta area schools spent 30 - 40% of their budget on book resources, 16 - 47% on non-print resources and 15 - 30% of the budget on technology resources. The study also found that 80% of the schools surveyed were using technology to access information.

Conclusions

Book and print expenditures command the greater portion of the annual budget according to the Atlanta area schools surveyed. Technology access to information is being used by most schools surveyed in the Atlanta area.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER                               | Page |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| 1 Introduction                        |      |
| Overview .....                        | 1    |
| Statement of the Problem .....        | 4    |
| Significance of the Study.....        | 4    |
| Assumptions .....                     | 5    |
| Delimitations .....                   | 6    |
| Definition of Terms.....              | 6    |
| 2 Review of the Literature            |      |
| Planning for the Library Media Center |      |
| Budget .....                          | 8    |
| Allocation Considerations .....       | 12   |
| Technology in the Media Center .....  | 17   |
| Need for Print Material .....         | 22   |
| Summary .....                         | 25   |
| 3 Methodology and procedures          |      |
| Description of Study.....             | 27   |
| Population.....                       | 27   |
| Instrumentation .....                 | 28   |
| Data Collection .....                 | 29   |
| Data Analysis.....                    | 30   |
| 4 Results .....                       | 31   |
| 5 Discussion and conclusion           |      |
| Findings .....                        | 45   |
| Discussion .....                      | 46   |
| Application .....                     | 51   |
| References.....                       | 52   |
| Appendix .....                        | 56   |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table                                                          | Page |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1 Mean expenditure, acquisition and population                 | 32   |
| 2 Total population by school system                            | 33   |
| 3 Total annual budget by school system                         | 34   |
| 4 Average amount spent per pupil by school system              | 35   |
| 5 Average annual expenditure by % for resources by all schools | 36   |
| 6 Annual expenditure distribution by % for resources           | 38   |
| 7 Books purchased per student by school system                 | 39   |
| 8 Frequency of technology information retrieval systems used   | 41   |
| 9 Frequency of Library Management Systems used                 | 42   |
| 10 Frequency of high schools using on-line databases           | 42   |
| 11 Frequency of schools using technology                       | 43   |
| 12 Purchase preference for additional resources                | 44   |

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all of the media specialists who took part in this study and so graciously gave of their time in responding to the survey.

I would also like to thank my fellow classmates for their friendship and support during the 6th year program.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### OVERVIEW

School library media programs have been expanded over the years to include a greater variety of instructional materials. Library budgets of twenty years ago concentrated on print collection development. Today media specialists constantly evaluate a variety of instructional materials being introduced in the education market place. Technology reflects the shift in curriculum requirements of how students should be served in order to meet their academic and information needs. School media center collections will not meet the needs of today's student unless budgets reflect the infusion of a wide variety of materials (Callison, 1990). Bringing technology into the library collection development plan will forever change the form of information storage and retrieval and the means by which media specialists provide information services to the user.

Although most microform collections and technological systems are still relatively small, library media specialists are spending more money each year on these resources. Generally, high school media

specialists are accepting technology as a provider of information to students. Since the publication of "Standards for School Library Programs" in 1960, only four comprehensive surveys have been conducted by the federal government on school library media programs. A survey by Miller (1991) on the 1988-89 library media center expenditures shows an average of \$14.00 per student is spent for print, non-print and technology resources for the media center. An examination of spending trends for resources in these areas offers insight for balancing information needs within budget limitations. Media specialists would benefit from up-to-date information regarding school library media program development and national trends on expenditures on information resources (Miller, 1991).

High school media centers have gradually incorporated technology as a significant resource for information accessing. Unfortunately, the availability of technology in school media centers is often bound by the constraints of a very limited budget. Eisenberg (1990) states, "We cannot ignore or dismiss the tremendous potential of technology by accepting current financial limitations" (p. 140). In the selection process of choosing resources for the learning center, the media specialist evaluates the benefit of each tool for the user, and at the same time, realizes cost and viability within collection development.

Fortunately, most librarians believe in the need for a diverse and appealing collection. With the technology today, there seems to be a definite shift in collection development practices and budget priorities. School librarians are facing the reality of spending increasingly larger portions of their budget on electronic searching and periodicals (Kollasch, 1990). The high cost of electronic searching coupled with stagnant or shrinking budgets challenges the integrity of budget planning and collection development strategies. This often means juggling very precious resources. Kollasch (1990) states, "The budget area that can afford to be hit the most, because it is often the largest, is the line-item called books" (p. 68).

If technology is going to become a standard media center resource then it must eventually be designated as part of the budget and not detract from the book budget or other resource priorities. As more of the book budget is directed to periodicals and electronic searching resources, there often evolve significant gaps in an aging book collection. (Kollasch, 1990).

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Growing information needs and retrenchment of school library media budgets are realities media specialists must often recognize in planning allocations and expenditures.

The focus of this study was to examine how media specialists allocated funds in providing resources for print, reference material, periodicals, technology and audio-visual collections. The study was seeking insight to the following research questions:

1. What were the average annual expenditures for library media centers in 1991-1992?
2. What portion of these annual expenditures was spent on print, non-print and technology?

### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

School media specialists are under a tremendous amount of pressure when trying to meet the information needs of today's college bound students within the limitations of their budgets. Technology offers tremendous amounts of information retrieval with minimal effort, but often with huge price tags. By weighing the portion of their annual budget dedicated to technology and seeing how that budget

compares to other local high school learning centers, media specialists will more clearly see what their own media center budgets may accomplish. Each library media center has strong and weak areas in information services. This study could provide information on resource development strategies and programs. The library, as a service agency, has a responsibility to accommodate information needs of teachers and students (Barron and Bergen, 1990). The media specialist has the responsibility of providing for these needs through knowledge and visionary planning of appropriate resources. The results of this study may offer insight into balancing information needs.

### ASSUMPTIONS

The basic assumption in this study was that each media specialist has some direct influence on budget spending. It was assumed that most Atlanta area high school media centers were using some technology at the time of the survey.

### DELIMITATIONS

The survey was delimited to the five counties near Atlanta: Fulton County, Cobb County, Gwinnett County, Dekalb County, Cherokee County, Marietta City and Atlanta City schools. The survey was also delimited to high school media specialists' input because elementary and middle schools media specialists do not appear to be using technology as extensively and consistently in their media centers at this time.

### DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Library collection development** - activities related to building, maintaining and evaluating library collections and services including user need assessment, budget management and selection policy.

**Library resources** - Books, periodicals, microforms, audio-visuals, technology and materials that are acquired for patron use and research.

**Technology** - Implementation of educational resources using computers as the access to information in the media center.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As library media center technology is implemented in high schools, media specialists are seeing the need for more efficient use of resources, more accurate information retrieval and greater patron satisfaction. The library user of today seeks information and wants to have his/her needs met quickly. Technology increases the efficiency of information retrieval. However, budget limitation is an inhibiting factor in the development of technological resources.

Planning media center expenditures while trying to balance the overall library collection development presents a serious challenge to the media specialist. As technology becomes a significant resource for information retrieval, budgeting for this high cost item impacts the purchasing power of the budget for print and audio-visual resources. Media center budgets appear to not have increased in order to allow for continued collection development, and at the same time, implement technological access to information. The researcher was seeking information relating to (1) the role of the media specialist in planning appropriate information service, (2) collection development considerations in planning allocations and expenditures, and (3) the

impact of technology on media services and collection development practices.

### PLANNING THE LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER BUDGET

The media specialist, as an information specialist, provides a personal interface between the user and the source for the answer. Technology is changing the way people meet their information needs. If library media specialists are going to accommodate the needs of the user in a changing environment, then there must be a focus on the changing emphasis of the library collection. The collection as we have known it has been reconsidered and restructured as a result of electronic access. Owning a specific number of books and magazines will become far less important than providing immediate and current access to requested information. The collection of tomorrow will respond more to content concerns rather than to format considerations. In regards to bigger book collections being better, the size of book collections will, in fact, become irrelevant as information needs shift towards the timeliness of electronic access (Mancall, 1991).

Restructuring schools is a modern concept most educators are using to bring about change. The restructured school library is an information utility that should meet the school's needs in this informational age. School curriculum is demanding more of the student, and media centers have the dual responsibility of providing effective resources and of spending the budget wisely (Barron & Bergen, 1992).

A review of the literature reflects the transition of yesterday's libraries to today's school library media centers. Considering the materials and means of selection at the time, the money that found its way to the school libraries was spent hastily, but well. Media centers through the last three decades have continued to grow and to develop with new technologies. The mission of the school library program as stated in *Information Power* (1988) is "to insure that students and staff are effective users of ideas and information" (cited in Barron & Bergen, 1992). Library programs must be continually and systematically planned, implemented and evaluated. Library media specialists must be well-versed in the wide range of technologies required to supply the school with information- -whether the source is traditional print materials, audio-visual resources or carefully selected CD-ROM databases (Barron & Bergen, 1992).

The American Library Association published the first set of standards for high school libraries in 1920. Subsequent standards followed in 1945 and 1960, but these were primarily print oriented. The unified library media concept evolved in the 1960's and was documented with the publication of the 1969 AASL and NEA standards. The standards for school library media programs in 1975 (AASL and AECT) and 1988 were published and continued to promote the library media center concept. INFORMATION POWER is the current comprehensive directive of library media programs guidelines by American Association of School Libraries and Association for Educational Communications and Technology (Shontz, 1991).

Recent studies show library media center expenditures have declined 16% in public schools since last surveyed in 1979. Collection items in school media centers declined from 71% of total expenditures in 1978 to 62% in 1985. Audio-visual equipment commanded 28% of the total media center budget in 1985. Dollars are being shifted from one area to another rather than new dollars being added, and the overall media collection has suffered. The 1987 U.S. Department of Education report shows the number of books added to collections has been declining. The data also indicated

essentially no growth in the collection size over the seven years of national surveys (Callison, 1990.)

Research by Saley (1986) shows an annual expenditure of \$5.56 per pupil for library books in a school of 1,000 students would add fewer than 300 books to a library media collection. A telephone inquiry of 16 random schools was made by Saley in 1984, and the following averages were obtained: the collection size averaged 20,000 volumes, the periodical budget averaged \$2,235, the book budget averaged \$10,000 with the number of titles added to the print collection averaging 891, and the non-print budget averaged \$5,142 with the number of items added to the non-print collection averaging 70. Recent statistics show the average media specialist spent \$3,100 on books, adding 350 volumes, \$865 on periodicals, \$500 on microforms and \$1,250 for audio-visual resources. The average budget of \$8,738 provides \$14.47 per pupil spending power. The research showed only \$5.50 per pupil amount was spent for books (Miller & Shontz, 1989).

Library media specialists in the northeast spend more of their money on print materials and have the largest book, periodical, and microform collection as well as the smallest audio-visual and software collection. In contrast, southern schools continue to have the smallest

book collection and the largest audio-visual collection (Miller & Shontz, 1991).

### ALLOCATION CONSIDERATIONS

A priority goal for all school library media specialists is to develop collections which meet the needs of both teachers and students. In achieving this objective, media specialists must allocate funds effectively. The modern school library media center has three important tasks: (1) to collect and make available materials that meet curriculum requirements and to provide for the diverse learning skills of the individual, (2) to provide the faculty with professional materials for curriculum and instructional planning, and (3) to make available materials for recreational reading that contributes to the life experiences of the user and his/her fulfillment (Tjoumas & Blake, 1989). The school library media specialist has the responsibility of translating these goals into reality by developing a collection that meets the needs of the user. An essential component of this process is allocating funds effectively. Clearly, the school librarian needs a formula that is viable and easy to implement. Tjoumas and Blake (1989) found, however, that "A survey of the literature specifically

focusing on school library media centers failed to reveal a discussion of allocation procedures" (p. 110).

School budgets often do not address the cost for developing new technologies. Electronic resources are not inexpensive, nor is the hardware required to access the information. The media specialist must decide whether to acquire these products now or to wait. Prices for electronic databases have fallen since the technology was first introduced. The question facing media specialists is whether to acquire these new technologies now and begin implementing them or to wait in anticipation that prices will decrease even more in the near future (Barlow, Karnes, & Marchionini, 1987).

A program budget defines how a media center's resources will be allocated to achieve program goals. Media Center resource planning is dependent on the budget, and conversely, effective budgeting is a consequence of good planning. A good plan becomes a powerful tool for budget requests when administrative approval is needed (LeBaron & Markuson, 1991).

Today's media specialist has the overwhelming challenge of balancing the budget while meeting the growing needs of today's user. The ever-burgeoning use of electronic searching, coupled with shrinking budgets, forces the media specialist into making very important financial decisions. Some schools might have generous

electronic searching budgets, but the source often comes by diverting one part of the budget to fund another. This reduces the flexibility in other budget decisions. Electronic searching is expensive. It is often funded by a small budget and on a limited basis (Kollasch, 1990).

Expense constraints dictate that only one or two CD-ROM workstations can be found in most high schools. This often constitutes a large percentage of the budget. Cost will continue to be a major factor in making technology available to high school students (Kirsch, 1989). New technologies are badly needed in most secondary school libraries. Developing electronic systems of information retrieval is an expensive project few school library budgets can handle without an impact on total collection development (Niemeier, 1990).

In evaluating what students and faculty need today, high school media specialists should provide an electronic database for bibliographic data, and periodicals or microforms to support that database. Achieving this often means spending book budget money which supports a very popular and necessary part of the collection (Kollasch, 1990). The secondary school media specialist confronting this allocation procedure faces a major obstacle- -determining the importance of expenditures as it relates to departmental needs. In meeting the needs of a program of study for college preparatory,

college bound students should not be valued as more important than vocational career students. Book budgets are rarely generous enough to meet all departmental needs (Tjoumas & Blake, 1989).

The school media specialist will have an expanded role in the budgeting process as schools search for more effective utilization of the education dollar. Two phenomena are responsible for changes in budgetary allocations: restructuring of schools and declining school funds. Through training and experience, the school media specialist has both instructional and management background. Because of this dual background, the media specialist can be an effective agent in school restructuring. These changes have come about through new priorities in allocations for various media resource choices (Bennett & Brocato, 1991).

In evaluating facets of the library media center collection development plan, the two logical budget items to which to attach technology expense would be periodicals and media services (Zink, 1990). This strategy would impact print resource development dramatically.

According to an extensive study conducted by Miller and Shontz (1991) on the 1989-1990 school library media budget for 1000-1999 students, the following statistics were cited:

| <u>Media Expenditures</u>                            |         |                                  |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------------------|
| Books                                                | \$5.993 | providing 542 additional volumes |
| Periodical                                           | 1,580   |                                  |
| Audio visual materials                               | 1,818   | providing 37 additional items    |
| Microforms                                           | 578     |                                  |
| Computer Software                                    | 490     |                                  |
| for a total media materials expenditures of \$13.475 |         |                                  |

The researcher focused on expenditures for collection development in school library media centers. The research indicated a steady escalation in the use of microcomputers for program development. The median figure from the table indicates accurately the expenditures reported by most library media centers.

The inability of school library media specialists to buy one book per student is shown in the research findings. Survey data supports the knowledge that budgets for library media centers are falling further behind each year. Library media specialists are spending less money on books than they do on non-book resources (periodicals, audio-visual materials, microforms, and computer software and equipment). This information along with a tally of discarded volumes

and projected inflation rates will make a powerful case for improved funding (Miller and Shontz, 1991.)

### TECHNOLOGY IN THE MEDIA CENTER

The purpose of the library media program is to meet the information needs of the user. The media specialist must try and balance the library collection development by including a variety of resources while at the same time trying to balance the budget. Technology typically incorporates previously established materials and makes information available quickly. Over a short period of time the steady escalation of the use of technology for information retrieval has resulted in re-evaluating spending priorities. Since its inception six years ago, technology has grown from an interesting novelty to a major information medium (Barron and Baumbach, 1990).

Technology can enhance information retrieval in the media center for such tasks as locating books and materials by key word searching. The media specialist can create a positive attitude, as well as, a basic understanding of the role of technology in education today. As a result of technology in the school media center, the media specialist must address the implications of change in resource utilization and budgetary considerations (Smith & Swigger, 1984).

With the current emphasis on global education, media specialists must provide changes in the definition and direction of collection development to meet the needs of students. Media specialists are faced with the challenge of developing a global perspective, analyzing the impact of new technologies, considering the nature and composition of the collection, and promoting an understanding and appreciation of the connectedness of information and ideas (Aaron, 1990).

The extent of school media center's use of technology is not known exactly. Technology enhances traditional school library media services by providing new kinds of access to information. As a result of technology, the job of the media specialist is expanding. The infusion of computer hardware and software, and their application in the learning process, adds a new dimension to library media center services. The problems of technology selection, evaluation and acquisition must be addressed by the media specialist (Smith & Swigger, 1984).

As technology becomes more readily available to the user, the library media specialist can assume greater responsibility for integrating information skills into the curriculum. The presence of electronic resources in the library media center provides a positive perception of the school library media specialist as an innovator, as a

leader in the area of new and emerging technologies, and as an educator interested in meeting the needs of the students (Baumbach, 1990).

A school library that is connected electronically to information will bring the broad world of knowledge within its walls. In collection development of the future, access replaces ownership and content supersedes format considerations. Future collection development practices should be altered (Mancall, 1991).

Before electronic magazine and newspaper indexes were available, students faced an almost impossible task of locating extremely current information. For example, a book purchased about contemporary rock musicians would be quickly out-of-date. With technology, however, a student can retrieve many newspaper and magazine articles as recent as the previous month by using a combination of CD-ROM (for searching) and microfiche (for retrieval) (Buboltz & Ling-Louie, 1991). The material is less likely to be lost or damaged in microform, and information can be further secured against vandalism if the source is full text on CD-ROM.

Multimedia innovations are creating an environment that necessitates new skills in processing and producing information. Schools continue to function with print still being the dominant source of information. School libraries are being challenged by the

expanding electronic environment of information. What is needed is a systematic process for the acquisition and application of hardware and software. Media specialists see technology, when properly channeled and directed, as contributing significantly to the learning process (Considine, 1985).

Technology can help school library media specialists meet the many challenges of today's information-literate student. Computers offer access to massive amounts of information contained in a small space and can be quickly retrieved. CD-ROM databases are a relatively new technology for school libraries. Only time and well-designed research studies will give educators adequate information about the effects of this instructional resource on the school library media center. Schools with CD-ROM based indexes, such as Readers' Guide, are reporting increased circulation of materials indexed. Coping with increased demand for use of computerized access to information is a problem when workstations are limited and when this resource is incorporated into the curriculum. Budgeting for this technology is essential in both long and short-range planning (Baumbach, 1990). User behaviors will be altered with technology because the focus will be on acquiring information rather than on the format in which it is available. The user will be dealing with multiple

rather than single concepts as a result of electronic databases (Mancall, 1991).

By determining what information students will need and to identify potential sources of information, media specialists can assist students in developing search strategies. They can guide the student to a variety of formats and sources by developing research skills. Most of the literature supports the growing trend of focusing on electronic searching and Boolean strategies. A variety of technology sources (mostly electronic indexing databases) will guide students to articles and sources in print or microform (Pawlowski & Troutman, 1991).

Barlow, Karnes and Marchionini (1987) offer several recommendations when considering the implementation of technology. First, proceed with caution in adapting this technology in school libraries. Learning centers are littered with the remnants of innovations that, at first, seemed interesting and promising. The value of any of these new products to a specific group of users must be judged just as critically as the value of any other new information product. "The introduction of any innovation or technology into the school library media center can be accompanied by the assumption that it will produce a variety of positive and negative effects" (Baumbach, 1990, p. 1450). Overall, the potential advantages of ease of access must be weighed against the disadvantages of high

cost of implementation (Barlow, 1987). The use of technology in even the smallest school library has been well documented in the literature. The convenience savings in shelf space to store microforms to support these systems, and ease in use, are decided advantages (Saley, 1985).

As advocates of technology, Buboltz & Ling-Louie wrote, "Our students as adults will not look for information in textbooks. We need to think in terms of teaching our students to use the kinds of resources they might be using in the future" (p. 13).

#### NEED FOR PRINT MATERIAL

Balance in an electronic era may be difficult in the school library media center as media specialists easily become mesmerized by the new access capabilities with technology. Media center collection developers might neglect those aspects of the program which were a foundation in the past. A balanced and healthy program development plan should provide books as well as information that meet the user's needs in academic and personal areas. Knowledge of what is available will remain a keystone of excellent collection development. An awareness of print tools and materials, such as encyclopedias, handbooks and the latest novels, will be necessary because these

materials continue to be viable resources. However, an even more important reason for continued knowledge of what is available in print, in an increasingly electronic world, is that users will need an opportunity to explore physical entities such as books and magazines. Accidental browsing can lead to a new idea or perspective (Mancall, 1991).

The 1987 U.S. Department of Education report stated, "The number of books added to collections has been declining. Public schools averaged 502 new books in 1974 compared to 315 in 1985" (cited in Callison, 1990, p. 58.)

Research was done on book collections as a whole, and the study showed that books less than six years old had the highest relative use factor. Student use declined markedly as the age of the book increased. Paperback books have a very high relative use factor. Students show a strong preference for new fiction books. The use of science books does not show the same discrimination, but the technical collection needs to be constantly updated with timely information. Flexibility and an understanding of user needs are essential to the development of a good collection (Bertland, 1991).

The print collection should not be ignored due to the strong influence of information technology. Facing rising costs and dwindling budgets, media specialists are reducing journal subscriptions and

book orders. Librarians are concerned with the "holes" created in their collection. This financial crisis is forcing a reshaping of the mission of media centers. The decision to buy periodicals and full text databases concerns many media specialists who wonder if their collection may be approaching imbalance. Considering the choices in technology, media specialists need to be keeping up with all advancing resources available (Nicklin, 1992).

Research by Miller and Shontz (1989) shows very clearly that expenditures for non-print resources outstrip expenditures for books. The table for total budget and total books budget for high schools with enrollment of 1000-1999 shows an average of \$6,788 from a budget of \$14,531 is spent on books. This equates to 46% of the total average budget being spent on books.

In a subsequent survey by Miller and Shontz (1991) on the 1989-1990 school library media budget research showed less local money was spent for resources than in previous years of study. With the average price of an adult hardcover novel being \$20.01, a high school media specialist could purchase one novel for every four students. This research shows book collections have been deteriorating because media specialists cannot purchase one book per child year.

Research shows electronic searching in a magazine index generates more citations than does manual searching, resulting in

periodicals use that has soared. Magazine use creates another budget diversion away from books. The popularity of magazines among teens would justify its expense. The Magazine Publishers of America suggest that the average American adult reads ten magazines a month (cited in Kollasch, 1990). Magazines play a vital role in the choice high school students make selecting resources they are comfortable using. Magazines are bright, compact and timely. Books often appear tedious and overwhelming to students. A well designed collection for a school media center would include a diverse and engaging magazine collection that will attract teens and appeal to their sense of popular culture yet aid them in their academic pursuits (Kollasch).

### SUMMARY

Since the 1960's, much of the money formerly targeted for materials, both print and non-print, is being spent on technology. As a result, school media center book collections are out-of-date and are not relevant to the curriculum they were designed to support. Media specialists must use the funds available to them in the most efficient and prudent manner possible. Using traditional formats as well as new technologies, media specialists should develop the

collection resources to serve the instructional and personal needs of the user (Bowie, 1990). Dowlin (1984) states, "The role of the librarian is to provide information by collecting, storing, and retrieving it within a framework that guarantees access. The ability of the librarian, combined with information technology, provides a powerful tool for the user" (p. 34).

Library media center resources, consisting of materials and equipment, provide the information base needed to implement the media center program goals and objectives. The library media center collection must include appropriate materials and equipment regardless of format. Print, non-print, and electronic resources should be selected to meet the teaching-learning styles of all users (Shontz, 1991).

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to determine how high school media specialists allocate portions of their annual budget to achieve goals and objectives established by the local media committee and the local school district. This was a descriptive study using a questionnaire survey methodology as the data gathering instrument. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher and sent to high school media specialists in the Atlanta area.

### POPULATION

The population for this research study was all high school media specialists in the Atlanta area. The high schools included in the study were in Atlanta City, Marietta City, Cherokee County, Dekalb County, Fulton County, Gwinnett County and Cobb County.

### INSTRUMENTATION

In designing the questionnaire the researcher addressed budget allocation as direct as possible, requiring a limited amount of time necessary to complete the survey. The data gathering instrument underwent many changes and revisions before the final questionnaire was established. Eighteen colleagues in the graduate program at Georgia State University program during this time critiqued the survey and offered constructive suggestions for improvement. A field test was conducted using five media specialists from a group other than the sample population. A separate cover was attached (see Appendix A) requesting input regarding questionnaire design. Suggestions were implemented into final questionnaire design. The final five part questionnaire was composed of thirteen close-ended questions.

The questionnaire (see Appendix C) was designed to gather information that was needed in order to address the two research questions developed in Chapter 1 for this study. Since only high school media specialists were included in the survey, the only demographic information requested was the size of the school population, which was survey question 13.

Survey questions 1 and 13 addressed the first research question, what were the average annual expenditures for library media centers in 1991-1992.

Survey questions 2 through 12 were intended to answer the second research question, what portion of these annual expenditures was spent on print, non-print and technology.

### DATA COLLECTION

The questionnaire was mailed to high school media specialists on January 4, 1993. Enclosed was a cover letter (see Appendix B) explaining the purpose of the survey, a self-addressed, stamped envelope and the three-page questionnaire. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire within 5 working days.

The schools surveyed were not asked to identify themselves so that confidentiality could be maintained. Each school was identified by a number on the questionnaire. This number was used for tabulation purposes and for follow-up of non-respondents.

Post cards were sent to the media specialists who had not returned their questionnaire by January 13, 1993. Questionnaires received after February 1, 1993 were not included in the results.

### DATA ANALYSIS

Following the return of the answered questionnaires, the results were taken to the Georgia State University Research Center. The data collected was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. Descriptive statistical analyses were used to determine frequencies and percentages of response.

## CHAPTER 4

### Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the spending strategies of high school media specialists regarding the 1991-1992 media center annual budget. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the 72 survey instruments mailed to all high school media specialists in the five counties in the Atlanta area were returned, resulting in 56 responses. All returned surveys were used.

Survey questions 1 through 13 relate to Research Question 1 which addresses the average annual expenditures for high school library media center resources in 1991 - 1992. Media specialists were asked for print, non-print and technology expenditures and student enrollment for that academic year. The information reported in tables 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 relate to Research Question 1.

Table 1 reflects the mean expenditure, acquisition and population for all high school media centers surveyed from questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13 of the surveys returned.

TABLE 1

Mean expenditure, acquisition and population for high school  
library media centers surveyed

| expenditure/acquisition/population | N=56 | Mean     |
|------------------------------------|------|----------|
| Total expenditure                  |      | \$17.092 |
| Book expenditure                   |      | \$6.611  |
| Number of books purchased          |      | 469      |
| Periodical expenditure             |      | \$1.868  |
| Number of magazine subscriptions   |      | 61       |
| Audiovisual expenditure            |      | \$2.603  |
| Technology expenditure             |      | \$4.292  |
| Supplies and miscellaneous         |      | \$1.346  |
| Population                         |      | 1.358    |

Table 1 shows the tabulation of all high school media centers surveyed to have a mean annual expenditure of \$17.092, providing 469 books and 61 magazine subscriptions with \$4.292 being spent on technology. The mean population is 1.358.

Table 2 reports the tabulation for the total population in 1991 - 1992 for the five counties surveyed in the Atlanta area from question 13 of the survey.

TABLE 2  
Total population by counties and  
school systems surveyed

| School System   | Frequency<br>N=56 | Total Population |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Cherokee County | 2                 | 3,300            |
| Cobb County     | 9                 | 14,189           |
| Dekalb County   | 16                | 17,050           |
| Fulton County   | 8                 | 9,847            |
| Gwinnett County | 10                | 16,950           |
| Atlanta City    | 10                | 9,141            |
| Marietta City   | 1                 | 1,250            |

Table 2 shows Cobb County, Dekalb County and Gwinnett County serve a greater population of the high schools surveyed.

Table 3 tabulates information from question 1 of the survey regarding the total annual budget by county and school system surveyed.

TABLE 3  
Total annual budget by county and  
school system surveyed

| School System   | Frequency<br>N=56 | Total Budget |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Cherokee County | 2                 | \$34.254     |
| Cobb County     | 9                 | 175.956      |
| Dekalb County   | 16                | 288.509      |
| Fulton County   | 8                 | 168.106      |
| Gwinnett County | 10                | 162.730      |
| Atlanta City    | 10                | 75.218       |
| Marietta City   | 1                 | 11.000       |

Table 3 shows Dekalb County to have the greatest annual budget and more schools served by that budget. Gwinnett County's budget is more than twice the budget of Atlanta City Schools with each serving the same number of schools.

Table 4 tabulates the information from tables 2 and 3 reporting the average amount spent per child for the 1991 - 1992 academic school year by each county or school system.

TABLE 4  
Average amount spent per pupil by counties  
and school systems surveyed

| School System   | Frequency | Average Amount<br>Spent per child |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
|                 | N=56      |                                   |
| Cherokee County | 2         | \$10.38                           |
| Cobb County     | 9         | 12.33                             |
| Dekalb County   | 16        | 16.92                             |
| Fulton County   | 8         | 17.07                             |
| Gwinnett County | 10        | 9.60                              |
| Atlanta City    | 10        | 8.23                              |
| Marietta City   | 1         | 8.80                              |

Table 4 shows that Fulton County spent \$17.07 per child enrolled and Atlanta City schools spent \$8.23 per child enrolled which reflects the highest and lowest expenditure per child for school library media center resources by individual school system.

Table 5 tabulates the average expenditure by percent for the various resources by all counties and school systems surveyed from questions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 of the survey.

TABLE 5

Average annual expenditure by % for resources purchased  
by all school systems surveyed

| Resource    | Average<br>Expenditure |
|-------------|------------------------|
| N=56        |                        |
| Books       | 36.5%                  |
| Periodicals | 11.2%                  |
| AV          | 15%                    |
| Misc        | 13.8%                  |
| Technology  | 23.5%                  |

Table 5 shows that print resources still command the greater portion of the annual budget. Technology is second in annual resource expenditures.

Survey questions 2 through 12 relate to Research Question 2 which addresses what portion of the annual expenditures was spent on print, non-print and technology. Tables 6 through 12 address Research Question 2.

Table 6 tabulates by percentage what portion of the annual budget was spent for information resources by each county and school system surveyed. Information for table 6 was taken from questions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 of the survey. Table 6 shows that book purchases still command the greater portion of the media center budget with technology expenditures being the second greatest cost in most cases for each school system surveyed.

TABLE 6  
Annual expenditure distribution by %  
for resources

---

| School System   | Books % | Periodicals % | AV % | Misc % | Technology % |
|-----------------|---------|---------------|------|--------|--------------|
| N=56            |         |               |      |        |              |
| Cherokee County | 36      | 12            | 1    | 26     | 25           |
| Cobb County     | 42      | 10            | 13   | 5      | 30           |
| Dekalb County   | 36      | 7             | 17   | 16     | 24           |
| Fulton County   | 43      | 12            | 12   | 4      | 29           |
| Gwinnett County | 37      | 12            | 12   | 13     | 26           |
| Atlanta City    | 32      | 19            | 30   | 6      | 15           |
| Marietta City   | 30      | 7             | 20   | 27     | 16           |

---

Table 7 calculates the total books purchased by each county and school system surveyed and the total population for each group and a book purchase per child ratio was determined. Tabulations for table 7 were taken from questions 2 and 13 of the survey.

TABLE 7  
Books purchased per student  
by school system

| School System   | Books<br>Purchased | Student<br>Population | Book Per<br>Child Ratio |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| N=56            |                    |                       |                         |
| Cherokee County | 2,169              | 3,300                 | .66                     |
| Cobb County     | 4,738              | 14,189                | .33                     |
| Dekalb County   | 5,982              | 17,050                | .35                     |
| Fulton County   | 5,060              | 9,847                 | .51                     |
| Gwinnett County | 4,653              | 16,950                | .27                     |
| Atlanta City    | 1,982              | 9,141                 | .22                     |
| Marietta City   | 300                | 1,250                 | .24                     |

Table 7 shows that Cherokee County book purchase provides a .66 (2/3) book per child. In contrast Atlanta City provides a .22 (less than 1/4) book per child.

Tables 8, 9 and 10 report the frequency of purchase or subscription to various technology systems for information retrieval from question 11 of the survey. Table 8 shows InfoTrac as the most frequently used magazine index. Newsbank is subscribed to by most school systems using technology. World Book and Golliers are the most frequently used CD-ROM encyclopedias.

Table 9 reports which library management systems are used by high school media center surveyed. Table 9 shows Columbia library management is the most frequently used system.

Table 10 reports the frequency of high schools using Dialog as an on-line database. Table 10 shows that 53.6% of the schools surveyed use Dialog as an on-line database resource.

TABLE 8  
Frequency of Technology information retrieval systems  
used by high school media centers

| Product                     | Frequency | %    |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------|
| InfoTrac                    | 24        | 42.9 |
| Newbank                     | 25        | 44.6 |
| Proquest                    | 17        | 30.4 |
| Ebsco magazine index        | 2         | 3.6  |
| Wilson magazine index       | 4         | 7.1  |
| Grollier encyclopedia       | 12        | 21.4 |
| World Book encyclopedia     | 12        | 21.4 |
| Compton's encyclopedia      | 6         | 10.7 |
| SIRS                        | 14        | 25.0 |
| Front page news             | 3         | 5.4  |
| Twayne literature           | 6         | 10.7 |
| Microsoft Book Shelf        | 4         | 7.1  |
| National Geographic Mammals | 4         | 7.1  |
| others                      | 8         | 14.3 |

TABLE 9  
Frequency of Library Management Systems used by  
high school media centers surveyed

| System used by high<br>school media center | Frequency | %    |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| Columbia                                   | 10        | 17.9 |
| Mandarin                                   | 6         | 10.7 |
| Follett                                    | 8         | 14.3 |
| Winnebago                                  | 3         | 5.4  |

TABLE 10  
Frequency of high schools using  
an on-line database

|        | Frequency | %    |
|--------|-----------|------|
| Dialog | 30        | 53.6 |

Table 11 reports the frequency of schools using technology for information retrieval which reflects the responses to question 9 of the survey.

TABLE 11  
Frequency of schools using technology

| Response | Frequency | %    |
|----------|-----------|------|
| No       | 9         | 16.1 |
| Yes      | 47        | 83.9 |

Table 11 shows that 83.9% of all schools surveyed are currently using technology.

Table 12 reports the responses for question 12 of the survey in which media specialists we asked what type of resource they would purchase if given an additional \$5,000.

TABLE 12  
Purchase preference for additional resources  
if given \$5,000

| Resource       | Frequency | %    |
|----------------|-----------|------|
| non-responsive | 2         | 3.6  |
| Print          | 7         | 12.5 |
| Non-print      | 2         | 3.6  |
| Technology     | 45        | 80.4 |

Table 12 shows that the majority of media specialists surveyed (80%) chose technology as the additional resource purchase preference.

## CHAPTER 5

### Discussion and conclusion

#### Findings

In determining the impact of technology on the high school media center budget in the Atlanta area, the findings are as follows:

1. The average annual expenditure for all high schools media centers surveyed for 1991-1992 was \$17,092. The average annual expenditure for high school media centers by county or school system surveyed was Cherokee County \$17,127; Cobb County \$19,550; Dekalb County \$18,031; Fulton County \$21,013; Gwinnett County \$16,273; Atlanta City \$7,521 and Marietta City \$11,000.

2. On the average, the portion of the annual expenditures provided \$8,479 for print resources (48%), \$3,949 for non-print resources (29%) and \$4,292 for technology resources (23%). The average annual expenditure by county or high school resulted in the following percentages for print, non-print and technology resources respectively.

### Discussion

The following table reflects by percentage what portion of the budget is spent for books and technology resources.

Print, Non-print and Technology expenditure by percentage

| School System   | Print | Non-print | Technology |
|-----------------|-------|-----------|------------|
| Cherokee County | 48%   | 27%       | 25%        |
| Cobb County     | 52%   | 18%       | 30%        |
| Dekalb County   | 42%   | 33%       | 24%        |
| Fulton County   | 55%   | 16%       | 29%        |
| Gwinnett County | 49%   | 25%       | 26%        |
| Atlanta City    | 51%   | 36%       | 15%        |
| Marietta City   | 37%   | 47%       | 16%        |

The amount spent for technology resources is the second highest amount spent for resources (23.5%). Print resources still command the greater portion of the annual budget (47.7%). This can be compared to the Miller & Shontz (1991) survey which calculated 46% of the budget was spent on print resources. The Atlanta area

schools appear to be in stride with the national trends by what portion of the annual budget is allocated for books.

An examination of the seven school systems surveyed in the Atlanta area reveals that 30 - 40% of the budget was spent on books, 16 - 47% on non-print resources, and an average of 15 - 30% was spent on technology (calculated from table 6). In comparison to the previous studies mentioned, this survey shows a definite shift from purchases of print resources to the purchase of technology resources to access information.

This study cites a wide range in books purchased per child. Table 7 shows that .24 to .66 books per child were purchased by the Atlanta area schools surveyed. The national average from the study done by Miller & Shontz (1991) shows that only 1 book per 4 students was purchased by media specialists. The Atlanta area schools have a larger budget for media resources resulting in a larger book per student ratio than the national average.

The survey done in the Atlanta area shows that InfoTrac is the most popular electronic index to magazines and most schools subscribing to a magazine index also subscribe to the newspaper index Newsbank (Table 8). The survey also revealed that 83.9% of the schools that responded are currently using technology to access information (Table 11). The participants were also asked what would

be their preference for type of resource should they be given an additional \$5,000. The survey showed 80% of the respondents would purchase technology over print and non-print resources (Table 12). While examining the surveys regarding this question, schools not currently using technology to access information chose print or non-print as an additional resource over technology. These schools had considerably smaller budgets that might not handle the burden of a technology resource purchase.

A future study could be done with an expanded sampling that included more counties. Middle schools and elementary schools could be included to see if information was being accessed through technology at these levels of instruction. A study could also be done on funding of resources for media centers. Results might reveal that some schools supplement their budget through PTA purchases and fundraisers, thus providing additional financial support from alternative resources. Cost seemed to be a significant factor regarding the incorporation and utilization of technology by media specialists. A study of sources of funding could prove helpful for media specialists looking to supplement their budget.

From the data reported in this survey, media specialists are struggling to keep their programs moving ahead with inadequate funding.

As the information base grows and access becomes easier, media specialists need to be committed to a collection development plan that stresses gathering and interpreting information from many different sources (Buboltz & Ling-Louie, 1991).

A review of the literature indicates the library media specialists are concerned about keeping abreast with technology and information access and applying computer technology to media center functions and services. The cost of automation and electronic information retrieval impacts the decisions for media center budget distributions. Collection developers of the 1990's will need to expand their knowledge of all tools available, print and non-print, in order to meet the growing demands of user needs.

Library media specialists are in an ideal position to insure information skills are a real part of every students learning experience. The media specialist can broaden information skills, becoming agents of change, integrating media center resources and the latest trends in school curriculum development (Anderson, 1991).

Media specialists must move forward more aggressively in the role of advocate for instructional programs in order to guarantee student access to a wide variety of resources and skills that will enable them to become lifelong learners.

Eisenberg (1990) states media specialists should be recognized for the timeliness with which they have become involved with computer use in the media center resource development. No other group of educators has come so far in embracing and applying computer technology. If we could predict the future in education, we should be able to look forward to using computers to retrieve reference sources in order to handle today's demand for information.

## APPLICATIONS

The findings of this study could be used as a reference in planning budget expenditures for media center resources. Examination of spending trends of other school systems in the area could be helpful in establishing spending priorities for media centers in the area or the state of Georgia.

## REFERENCES

- Aaron, S. L. (1990, Fall). The collection developer's link to global education. School Library Journal, 19, pp. 35 - 43.
- Anderson, M.A. (1991, November/December). Information skills for the 90s. Book Report, 10, p. 30.
- Barlow, D., Karnes, B., & Marchionini, G. (1978, November). CD-ROM in a high school library media center: A research project. School Library Journal, 34, pp. 66-72.
- Barron, A. & Baumbach, D. (1990, June). A CD-ROM tutorial: Training for new technology. Educational Technology, pp. 20-23.
- Barron, D.D. & Bergen, J., Jr. (1992, March). Information power: The restructured school library for the nineties. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, pp. 521-525.
- Baumbach, D. (1990, Spring). CD-ROM: Information at your fingertips! School Library Media Quarterly, 18, pp. 142-149.
- Bennett, J.A. & Brocato, F.C. (1991). Budgetary roles of the media specialist in the restructured school. Tech Trends, 36, no. 6. pp. 39-42.

- Berland, L.H. (1991, Winter). Circulation analysis as a tool for collection development. School Library Media Quarterly, 19, p. 90-97.
- Bowie, M.M. (1990, November/December). Collection development with microcomputer technology. Media Methods, 27, p. 26+.
- Buboltz, D. & Ling-Louie, R. (1991, November-December). On the trail of technology. Book Report, 10, pp. 13-15.
- Callison, D. (1990, Fall). A review of the research related to school library media collections: Part I. School Library Media Quarterly, 19, pp. 57-62.
- Considine, D. (1985, Summer). Media, technology, and teaching: What's wrong and why? School Library Media Quarterly, 13, pp. 173-182.
- Dowlin, K.E. (1984). The Electronic Library. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc. (p. 34).
- Eisenberg, M.B. (1990, Spring). Technology and the library media program: Focus on potential and purpose. School Library Media Quarterly, 18, pp. 139-141.
- Kirsch, R.A. (1989, September/October). CD-ROM in the high school library. Book Report, 8, pp. 19-22.

- Kollasch, M. (1990, November). Book: Serial as Peter: Paul?.  
Wilson Library Bulletin, 65, pp. 68-70.
- Le Baron, J. & Markuson C. (1991, December). Planning: A  
necessary anchor for the school media program. Wilson  
Library Bulletin, 66, pp. 42-45.
- Mancall, J. C. (1991, Winter). (Un)changing factors in the searching  
environment: Collections, collectors, and users. School Library  
Media Quarterly, 19, pp. 84-89.
- Miller, M.L. & Moran, B. (1987, June/July). Expenditures for  
resources in school library media centers, FY '85-'86. School  
Library Journal, 33, pp. 37-45.
- Miller, M.L. & Shontz, M. (1989, June). Expenditures for resources  
in school library media centers, FY '88-'89. School Library  
Journal, 35, pp. 31-40.
- Miller, M.L. & Shontz, M. (1991, August). Expenditures for resources  
in school library media centers, FY '89-'90. School Library  
Journal, 37, pp. 32-42.
- Nicklin, J.L. (1992, February). Rising costs and dwindling budgets  
force libraries to make damaging cuts in collection and services.  
Chronicle of Higher Education, 38, pp. 28-30.

- Niemeier, K. (1990, December). Funding technology for secondary school libraries. Computers in Libraries, 10, p. 50.
- Pawlowski, C. & Troutman, P. (1991, November/December). Blending print and electronic resources. Book Report, 10, pp. 14-17.
- Saley, A. (1985 Fall/1985-86 Winter). The effects of small budgets on the principals of development of collections for small school library media centers. Collection Development, 7, pp. 61-82.
- Shontz, M. (1991, September/October). Evaluation of resource center programs. Emergency Librarian, 19, p. 8-10 12-17 19-22, 24.
- Smith, L. & Swigger, K. (1984, Winter). Microcomputers in school library media centers. Drexel Library Quarterly, 20, pp. 7-14.
- Tjoumas, R. & Blake, V.L.P. (1989). Calculating budget allocations for secondary school library media centers: New perceptions based on a perusal of the past. Collection management, 11, p. 107-135.
- Zink, S.D. (1990, February). Planning for the perils of CD-ROM. Library Journal, pp. 51-55.

## Appendix

## Appendix A

November 17, 1992

Dear Media Specialist(s):

I am conducting a study of high school media center budgeting programs as part of the requirement for the Specialist Degree in Education at Georgia State University.

This study will hopefully reflect priorities in spending and how technology has impacted the amount allocated for the various resources in the media center.

Would you please take a few minutes to answer the enclosed questionnaire? Please comment below on your impression of this questionnaire. This will be very helpful to me before the final survey is mailed out.

YES NO

\_\_\_\_ Are all the words understood? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ Are directions clear? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ Does any aspect of the survey suggest bias? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_ Does the survey create a positive impression, one that  
 motivates the reader to answer it? \_\_\_\_\_

Please offer any additional comments or criticisms. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Sincerely,

Gayle Kurk  
 8930 Terrace Club Drive  
 Roswell, GA 30075  
 H-998-1880 W-551-2499

## Appendix B

January 4, 1993

Dear Media Specialist(s):

I am conducting a study of high school media center budgeting programs for 1991-1992 as part of the requirement for the Specialist Degree in Education at Georgia State University.

This study will hopefully reflect priorities in spending and how technology has impacted the amount allocated for the various resources in the media center.

Would you please take a few minutes to answer the enclosed questionnaire? Perhaps your media paraprofessional can be of assistance. Your reply will be confidential. The number on the questionnaire is for tabulation and for follow-up purposes only.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope by January 11, 1993.

Your time given to the completion of this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. If I can be of any assistance, please don't hesitate to call.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Gayle Kurk  
8930 Terrace Club Drive  
Roswell, GA 30075  
H - 998-1880  
W- 551-2499

Appendix C  
QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Budget

1. What was your total media center expenditure for 1991-1992? (Include money spent from all sources of income: state, local funds, PTA, etc., but exclude salary and facility expenses) \$\_\_\_\_\_ (approx).

II. Print Expenditures

2. How many books were purchased last year? \_\_\_\_\_
3. What amount was spent on books?  
\$\_\_\_\_\_
4. How many periodicals (print copies) do you subscribe to?  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. What amount was spent on print  
periodicals? \$\_\_\_\_\_

III. Non-Print Expenditures

6. What amount was spent on audio-visual  
material? \$\_\_\_\_\_
7. What amount was spent on microforms?  
\$\_\_\_\_\_
8. What amount was spent on supplies \$\_\_\_\_\_

#### IV. Technology

9. Are you currently using technology (computers) to access resources in your media center?

(circle one)

- a. No (go to question 12)
- b. Yes

10. What amount was spent on technology systems? \$\_\_\_\_\_

11. Indicate the technology product(s) used in your media center.

|                                  | System Name | Cost  |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| a. Magazine indexing             | _____       | _____ |
| b. Newspaper indexing            | _____       | _____ |
| c. CD-ROM (full text)            | _____       | _____ |
| (SIRS, encyclopedia, etc.)       | _____       | _____ |
| d. On-line databases             | _____       | _____ |
| e. cataloging and/or circulation | _____       | _____ |
| f. other                         | _____       | _____ |
|                                  | _____       | _____ |
|                                  | _____       | _____ |

**V. Planning**

12. If you had an additional \$5,000, on what would you spend it? (Select one type of resource)

\_\_\_\_\_ print

\_\_\_\_\_ non-print (audio-visuals)

\_\_\_\_\_ technology products

13. What was your student enrollment for 1991-1992?

(approx.) \_\_\_\_\_